

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
FORT WORTH DIVISION**

**SHAQUITA BRIELLARD,**

**Plaintiff,**

**vs.**

**IDAHO HOUSING and  
FINANCE ASSOCIATION**

**Defendant.**

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

**Civil Action No. 4:23-CV-1227-P (BJ)**

**FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE AND NOTICE AND ORDER**

In this case, Plaintiff has filed a civil case with a complaint and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. ECF Nos. 1, 2. The case was referred to the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Special Order No. 3. The findings, conclusions and recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge are as follows:

**FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

**A. NATURE OF THE CASE**

This case is a new civil action.

**B. PARTIES**

Shaquita Briellard is the plaintiff. Compl.1, ECF No. 1. She lists as defendant the Idaho Housing and Finance Association. *Id.* at 1-2.

**C. LEGAL ANALYSIS**

Plaintiff filed a completed a short-form application/motion to proceed in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 *et. seq.* ECF No. 2. That application/motion includes the income and asset information for the plaintiff.

Whether to permit or deny an applicant to proceed *in forma pauperis* (IFP) is within the sound discretion of the Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a); *Prows v. Kastner*, 842 F.2d 138, 140 (5th Cir. 1988). Courts should make the determination of financial ability after considering whether payment of the filing fee will result in the plaintiff “suffering undue financial hardship.” *Prows*, 842 F.2d at 140. “This entails a review of other demands on individual plaintiffs’ financial resources, including whether the expenses are discretionary or mandatory.” *Id.*

In her application, declared to be true under penalty of perjury, Plaintiff declares that she earns \$3,200 gross wages per month. ECF No. 2 at 1. Plaintiff has listed one dependent. *Id.* The poverty guidelines for a family of two is \$19,720. At a monthly income of \$3,200, Plaintiff’s annual income of \$38,400 is far above the applicable poverty level. Thus, based on the information in the application, Plaintiff has sufficient resources to pay the filing and administrative fees, and the undersigned recommends that Plaintiff’s in-forma-pauperis motion be **DENIED**.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that Plaintiff’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis [ECF No. 2] be **DENIED**.

It is further **RECOMMENDED** that the district judge inform Plaintiff that the complaint will be subject to dismissal without further notice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b), unless Plaintiff pays to the clerk of Court the filing and administrative fees of \$405.00<sup>1</sup> within seven (7) days after the district judge’s order.

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition to the filing fee of \$350, the District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule requires payment of an administrative fee for filing a civil action in district court of \$55. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) and District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule, note 14.

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO OBJECT TO PROPOSED  
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO OBJECT**

A copy of this report and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), each party to this action has the right to serve and file specific written objections in the United States District Court to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation within fourteen (14) days after the party has been served with a copy of this document. The United States District Judge need only make a de novo determination of those portions of the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation to which specific objection is timely made. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Failure to file by the date stated above a specific written objection to a proposed factual finding or legal conclusion will bar a party, except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice, from attacking on appeal any such proposed factual findings and legal conclusions accepted by the United States District Judge. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428–29 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded by statute* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the deadline to file objections from ten to fourteen days).

**ORDER**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff is granted until **December 28, 2023**, to serve and file written objections to the United States Magistrate Judge's proposed findings, conclusions and recommendation.

SIGNED December 14, 2023.

  
JEFFREY L. CURETON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE